



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,999	06/25/2003	Sean E. Aschen	END920030038US1	4751
26502	7590	05/31/2006	EXAMINER	
			ONI, OLUBUSOLA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2168	

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/603,999	ASCHEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	OLUBUSOLA ONI	2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04/14/2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 7-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 7-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

**Response to Amendment**

1. The amendment filed March 14, 2006 has been entered. The specification has been amended. Claims 1-6, and 20 are all cancelled. Claims 7 and 16 have been amended. New grounds of rejection are based on newly amended claims.
  
2. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benninghoff III (Pub No U.S 2002/0091782) hereinafter "Benninghoff" and Don Box et al. (W3C Copyright 2000) hereinafter "Don" and further in the view of Grout (Pub No U.S 5,913,033) hereinafter "Grout"  
  
As per claim 7, Benninghoff teaches " providing a mail file stored on a server of documents having ..." (See paragraph [0012], [0134] and Fig 2,3 & 7)  
"retrieving said fields of said one of said documents from said mailfile" (See paragraph [0134] and Fig 5,11);  
"in response to said fields, retrieving said one of said documents as a markup language document" (See paragraph [010-012] and [0134]);  
  
Benninghoff does not explicitly teach "inserting at said server, URL into said markup language document to retrieve said..."  
" retrieving at said server section from said mailfile in said markup language"

"removing at said server, said URL from the retrieved document and creating an object having said section expanded in the retrieved document"

However, Grout teaches "inserting at said server a URL into said markup language document to retrieve said section of said one of said document" (See [Col 1, lines 1-46]);

" retrieving at said server, said section from said mailfile in said markup language" (See [Col 1, lines 1-46]);

"removing at said server, said URL from the retrieved document and creating an object having said section expanded in the retrieved document" (See [Col. 1,lines 1-46])

At the time of the present invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the two references because Grout's method of inserting a URL and retrieving the designated section to replace the URL would have enabled Benninghoff's method of providing data to an application to increase the performance of browsing documents and allows downloading of multimedia objects tailored for the user's language or culture (See [Col 2, lines 59-64])

Benninghoff and Grout do not explicitly teach "receiving a request as a SOAP protocol message from an application running on a user workstation different from said server for one of said documents"

"sending marshaled objects to said application as a SOAP protocol message"

However, Don teaches "receiving a request as a SOAP protocol message from an application for one of said documents" (See paragraph [1.3-4] wherein Don teaches in

Art Unit: 2168

paragraph 2. Soap messages are fundamentally one-way transmissions from a sender to a receiver and Soap application receives a Soap message, whereby the message can only be received on the users workstation)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention because combining the aforementioned references with Don's teachings would have given those skilled in the art a tool for receiving request and sending objects as a SOAP message because, Soap provides a simple and lightweight mechanism for exchanging structured and typed information in decentralized, distributed environment.

As per claim 8, this claim is rejected on the grounds corresponding to the argument given above for rejected claim 7 above including the following reasons: Benninghoff teaches "wherein said fields are retrieved as a XML document"(See paragraph [0010-0012] and [0134])

As per claim 9, this claim is rejected on the grounds corresponding to the argument given above for rejected claim 7 above including the following reasons Grout teaches "wherein said markup language is HTML or XHTML" (See [Col 5, lines 45-61] and [Col 6, lines 60- Col 7, lines 45])

As per claim 10, this claim is rejected on the grounds corresponding to the argument given above for rejected claim 7 above including the following reasons: Benninghoff

teaches " wherein said one of said documents has a file attachment into object"(See Fig 3-4 &7)

As per claim 12, this claim is rejected on the grounds corresponding to the argument given above for rejected claim 7 above including the following reasons Grout teaches "said one of said document has an image tag"(See [Col 7, lines 1-44]).

As per claim 13, this claim is rejected on the grounds corresponding to the argument given above for rejected claim 12 above including the following reasons Grout teaches "retrieving the image tag, encoding said image tag and inserting..." (See [Col 6, lines 60 - Col 7, lines 45] and Fig 2A).

As per claim 14, this claim is rejected on the grounds corresponding to the argument given above for rejected claim 7 above including the following reasons Grout teaches "said one of said documents has a link to other items in said document" (See [Col 3, lines 13-32] and Fig 2A)

As per claim 15, this claim is rejected on the grounds corresponding to the argument given above for rejected claim 14 above including the following reasons Grout teaches " retrieving the content of said link, and inserting said content in the retrieved document at the position of said link" (See [Col 6, lines 60- Col 7, line 45] and Fig 2A)

As per claim 16, this claim is rejected on the grounds corresponding to the argument for rejected claim 7 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Benninghoff teaches “a file stored on a server, having data stored as documents” (See Paragraph [0012] and [0134] and Fig 2-3 & 7)

“a database on said server, for passing a request for one of said documents to said file and upon return converting said one of said documents ...” (See paragraph[0010 - 0012],[0134], [0161]and Fig 5, 11 &19);

“ an authentication directory having authentication records for an application” (See paragraph [0014], [0043], [0046], [0055], [0131] and Fig 5 & 12)

“ and a protocol tool for authenticating said application using said records” (See paragraph [0014], [0043], [0046], [0055], [0131] and Fig 5 & 12])

As per claim 17, this claim is rejected on the grounds corresponding to the argument given above for rejected claim 16 above including the following reasons: Benninghoff teaches “ Wherein said software and said tools are adapted to operate without the need for a mail or calendaring client” (See paragraph [0009] and Fig 1)

As per claim 18, this claim is rejected on the grounds corresponding to the argument given above for rejected claim 16 above including the following reasons: Benninghoff teaches “ wherein said extended markup format is XML” (See paragraph [0010-0012] and [0134])

Art Unit: 2168

As per claim 19, this claim is rejected on the grounds corresponding to the argument given above for rejected claim 16 above including the following reasons: Benninghoff does not explicitly teach “ wherein object is marshaled into simple object protocol according to a pre-defined set of rules”

However Don teaches “ wherein object is marshaled into simple object protocol according to a pre-defined set of rules”(See [1-5])

3. Claim 11, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benninghoff, Don and Grout, as applied to claim 4 above, and further in the view of Little et al. (Pub No. US 2005/0114671) hereinafter Little

As per claim 11, this claim is rejected on the grounds corresponding to the argument given above for rejecting claim 10 above including the following reasons:

Benninghoff, Don and Grout do not explicitly teach “retrieving attachment, removing said link, and inserting said attachment into said object”.

However, Little teaches “retrieving attachment, removing said link, and inserting said attachment into said object”(See paragraph [0076])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the aforementioned references because Little's method of embedding the attachment into the body of the email messages would have enabled Benninghoff and Grout's method of providing data to an application to save user's effort and time needed to open and store the attachment, by already displaying the attachment within the body of the email message.

**Response to Argument**

4. Applicant's arguments filled March 14, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The examiner respectfully traverses applicant's argument.

As per claims 7 and 16 applicant's argued Benninghoff does not teach, "inserting at said server, URL into said markup language document to retrieve said..."

" retrieving at said server section from said mailfile in said markup language"

"removing at said server, said URL from the retrieved document and creating an object having said section expanded in the retrieved document"

However based on newly amended claims, Grout teaches "inserting at said server a URL into said markup language document to retrieve said section of said one of said document" (See [Col 1, lines 1-46]);

" retrieving at said server, said section from said mailfile in said markup language" (See [Col 1, lines 1-46]);

"removing at said server, said URL from the retrieved document and creating an object having said section expanded in the retrieved document" (See [Col. 1,lines 1-46])

At Col. 1, lines 21-46, Grout teaches in order to retrieve a document, entering a URL at the server. Wherein the URL is removed from the retrieved document and downloading links to other multimedia object, which consist of bitmap, sound files or video files, thus teachings are synonymous and reads on applicants claim language.

### **Conclusion**

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OLUBUSOLA ONI whose telephone number is 571-272-2738. The examiner can normally be reached on 7.30-5.00PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TIM VO can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

OLUBUSOLA ONI  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2168



TIM VO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER